# REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

## FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF 10004 CHANNEL ROAD, TM 5463RPL<sup>1</sup>, R07-008, S05-068, LOG NO. 05-14-41

**December 7, 2007** 

I. HABITAT LOS	SS PERMIT (	ORDINANCE -	– Does the p	ropose	ed project conform to the	
Habitat Loss Per					,	
	YES	NO	NOT API	PLICA ⊠	BLE/EXEMPT	
boundaries of the	e Multiple Spo	ecies Conserv	ation Prograi	m. Th	nts are located within the erefore, conformance to us is not required.	
II. MSCP/BMO - Conservation Pro					Itiple Species	
	YES	NO	NOT API	PLICA	BLE/EXEMPT	
	are within the oject conforritigation Ordin	e boundaries on the Mu	of the Multiple ultiple Specie	e Spe s Con	cies Conservation servation Program and	
III. GROUNDWA the San Diego Co				omply	with the requirements of	
	YES	NO	NOT API	PLICA ⊠	BLE/EXEMPT	
which obtains wa	ater from surf	ace reservoirs	and/or impo	rted so	adres Dam Water District ources. The project will or domestic supply.	
IV. RESOURCE	PROTECTIO	N ORDINANO	CE - Does the	e proje	ect comply with:	
The wetland and (Article IV, Section Protection Ordinal)	ns 1 & 2) of the		YES 	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEM	1PT

The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES ⊠	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Article IV, Section 5)?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Section 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES ⊠	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

#### Discussion:

#### Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

#### Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

#### Steep Slopes:

The average slope for the property is less than 25 percent gradient. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

#### Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Mark Slovick on October 5, 2007 and review by staff biologist Valerie Walsh. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

### Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff, it

TM 5463, R07-008, S05-068 - 3 - LOG NO. 05-14-41;10004 CHANNEL ROAD

December 7, 2007

has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources.

<u>V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO)</u> - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
$\boxtimes$		

Discussion: The project Stormwater Management Plan received April 17, 2007 was reviewed for this project and appears to be complete and in compliance with the WPO.

<u>VI. NOISE ORDINANCE</u> – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
$\boxtimes$		

Discussion: Even though the proposal could expose people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County General Plan or Noise Ordinance), the following noise mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the noise impacts to applicable limits:

Based on the Noise Study report prepared by Urban Crossroads received on September 26, 2007, the location of the 60 dBA CNEL contour includes the entire lot, impacting all of the proposed eight (8) units with future traffic noise levels exceeding County Noise Element sound level limit of 60 CNEL. Staff recommends a Noise Protection Easement over the entire lot. Noise affected private balconies located on the northwestern and northeastern facades of the condominium development will be as high as 67.2 CNEL at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and 68.9 CNEL at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. Northwestern and northeastern private balconies located on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors require an eight (8) foot high noise barrier, reducing future traffic noise levels and meeting County Noise Element sound level limit of 60 CNEL. Proposed tot lot area and group useable open space will experience future traffic noise impacts as high as 66.5 CNEL and 61.5 CNEL. Noise mitigation is required for these areas and will be in a form of an eight (8) foot high noise barrier. The noise barrier will be in an L-shaped form wrapping the tot lot area on two sides, running along the tot lot's northern and eastern edges. The tot lot and group useable noise barrier will ensure compliance with 60 CNEL sound level limit. Therefore, implementation of the recommended mitigation and dedication of the Noise Protection Easement will ensure compliance with County Noise regulations.